

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/729,751	BONACCIO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ji H. Bae	2115	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ji H. Bae. (3) _____.

(2) Anthony M. Palagonia. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 June 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 15,22 and 41.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

THOMAS LEE
SENIOR PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner proposed numerous amendments to correct for typographical errors, and to ensure consistency in the claim language. Additionally, the examiner proposed cancelling a duplicate claim 41, which was numbered claim 41 but recited different limitations from the "other" claim 41. New claim 47 was added which recites the exact same limitations as the cancelled claim. Applicant's attorney authorized the amendments.